ZIONISM.

WHEN the Jews in England were granted full political rights, what were the arguments used to justify the gift? The main argument of the Jews was that it was only certain religious doctrines and practices which separated them from their Christian fellow-citizens. A Jew, resident in England, was an Englishman of the Jewish faith, just as a Jew, whose home was France, was a Frenchman of the Jewish faith. It is true that he was probably (though by no means certainly) of Semitic origin, but his race was a matter of antiquarian genealogy: it did not affect his loyalty to his fatherland. If his mother had been a proselyte to Judaism, or if his father had been the son of such a proselyte, he was none the less a Jew. His Judaism was a matter of religion and of religion only. It was true that Jews thought it right to marry only among themselves, but the reason was not tribal exclusiveness. It was purely religious. A small minority could only retain its religious separateness in this particular way. If the minority were freely to marry "outside," it must sooner or later be absorbed into the majority. Many years after the emancipation the English Chief Rabbi declared that the great bond which united the Jews together was not one of race (notoriously the Jewish "race" is very mixed), but of religion.

It was, moreover, argued that the religious differences between Jew and Christian were not of a kind to prevent social intercourse between them, or to make the Legislature hesitate as to granting the fullest civic and political emancipation. The Sacred Book of the Jews formed a part of the Sacred Book of the Christians. The moral law was the same for both: the moral conceptions and ideals of both were, to all intents and purposes, identical.

There was nothing in Jewish practice or belief which should hinder the granting of political emancipation. The interests of the English Jew were as much identified with England as the interests of the English Christian. His language was English: from England he drew his culture; English literature was no less *his* literature than it was to the purest Anglo-Saxon. It is true that in his synagogues he employed a sacred language, and that he usually learnt enough of this language to understand the Jewish liturgy and a few chapters of his Sacred Book. But just so did the Roman Catholic use Latin. It is true, again, that if fellow-Jews were persecuted in an eastern land he protested

and he grieved; but if fellow-Christians were persecuted in an eastern land, Christian Englishmen protested and grieved in precisely similar a way. And, lastly, it is true that it was a dogma of his religion that, at "the end of days," there would come a Messiah, and that God would then "restore" all the Jews to Palestine, and Messiah would be their King there for many years; but this dogma had no influence whatever upon his life. It was a pious dogma, just as to some of his Christian fellow-citizens the second Coming of Christ was a pious dogma, which was believed in and prayed for, but which had no relation to action and life. For it was all to happen in such a *very* distant future, and it was to be brought about, not by human agency, but by direct Divine intervention. Man was not even to smooth the way. At the end of days God would do it all by Himself: no human preparation was necessary or desirable.

Such were the arguments and reasons upon which both Jew and Christian relied, and upon the strength of them the battle of emancipation was fought and won. Closely similar were the reasons which brought about emancipation in many other European countries. The Jews were everywhere supposed to have identified themselves in sentiment and aspiration with the various peoples among whom they dwelt. The English Jews not only lived *in* England, but were *of* England. They brought their intelligence and their virtues into the common stock.

I do not think that England need regret its decision. English Jews have proved in many ways their title to be regarded as no less Englishmen than their Christian fellow-citizens.

But it can, unfortunately, no longer be said that the arguments which were used universally by the Jews themselves in favour of their emancipation seventy years ago could, or even would, be used by all of them to-day. A very dangerous movement has arisen among them, which, unless checked, may hinder their emancipation in countries where this emancipation is yet to seek, and even imperil its continuance (in the spirit, if not, necessarily, in the letter) in countries where that emancipation has already been attained. It is no wonder that the movement is everywhere applauded and approved by their enemies, if also, sometimes, in kindly ignorance or sentimentality by their friends.

The movement in question is familiarly known as Zionism. What are the assumptions of this movement, what are its methods and what are its aims?

Its assumptions are that the old arguments which secured Jewish emancipation are fundamentally false. According to the leaders of the movement, the Jews are not merely, or even mainly, a religious community; they are a people, a nation,

STADTBIBLIOTHEK FRANKFURT a. M.
Stadt- u. Univ.-Bibl. Frankfurt/Main

though a people, or a nation, at present without a home. According to the old view, the Jews are fully at home in every country which gives to them religious, civic, and political liberty and equality. To the English Jews England is their home and their only home. To the Jews who fought and won the battle of emancipation their "people" was the English people. To the new Jewish nationalists their "people" are the Jews. They ostentatiously talk of "our people," when they mean, not England or their English fellow-citizens, but their fellow-Jews, *whether in England or elsewhere.*

Many adherents of the movement neither believe in any form of the Jewish religion nor practise any of its rites. They are "national" Jews pure and simple. To the Jews of the emancipation era (and to many of their successors) a Jew who no longer believes in Judaism was a Jew no longer. He may be a Jew by descent, but that is all. On the other hand, to the nationalists, a Jew may be as non-believing and as non-conforming as you please, and yet so long as he is keen on the "nation" and on "national" aims, he may be a most excellent Jew. Apparently, however, he must not adopt any *other* religion if he is still to be reckoned a Jew. Apparently, the Jewish nation is to be composed, so far as religion is concerned, of two classes: (1) Those who profess some form of the Jewish religion, (2) those who are agnostics and atheists. It is, apparently, not permitted to be a member of the Jewish people, or of the Jewish nation, and to be at the same time a Mahommedan, a Christian, or a Buddhist.

Now a few words as to the methods and aims of the movement. The aim is to reconstitute the Jewish nation. Just as the Serbians or the Bulgarians sought, and helped, to create the new and autonomous States of Serbia and Bulgaria, so would the new nationalist Jews seek to create a new and autonomous State for the Jews. And they desire to create it in the old Jewish home. Nineteen hundred years ago there *was* some sort of petty Jewish State in Palestine, even though it formed part of the Roman Empire. Such a State, it is hoped, may exist again, guaranteed by the Powers, or, perhaps, an autonomous province of some larger empire which happens to include Palestine. A few years ago Jewish nationalists would not have minded at all if the Empire had been Turkey. In fact, Turkey and Mahommedanism were much belauded. Now Turkey is, for obvious reasons, unpopular, and other empires are talked of and flattered.

So far as the Jews themselves are concerned, a main method towards the desired end is the endeavour to foster, augment, and stimulate in every possible way the national spirit. To that end

efforts are made to turn Hebrew from a dead, sacred language into a living, national one. Or, again, instead of all efforts being made to induce emigrants from Russia into England to drop and abandon the jargon kown as Yiddish (a mixture of German and Hebrew with Russian and Polish ingredients), they are positively encouraged to continue the use of that separatist and separating tongue. Again, it is argued that, over and above a Jewish religion, and independent of it, there is a national Jewish "culture," which must be sedulously fostered, preserved, and intensified. A Jew who is in all respects the same as his Christian fellow-citizen in aspirations, tastes, habits, and ideals (with the sole exception of certain religious doctrines), is looked down upon as a miserable assimilationist, and is openly held up to reprobation and ridicule. As there is a national French, Italian, or Serbian civilisation, a French, Italian, or Serbian way of looking at life, so there is, apparently, a national Jewish way of looking at life, a national Jewish civilisation. And, with the establishment of a Jewish State, this civilisation (with the help of a Jewish university at Jerusalem) will become still more intensive, peculiar, characteristic, and it will pervade the souls and minds of all those Jews whom Palestine may be, temporarily, too small to hold, and who have still, to their misfortune, to remain in *Galuth* (exile), or form part of the *Diaspora*.

How did this strange and retrograde movement arise? Its origin is entirely due to anti-Semitism. The founder of Zionism was an Austrian Jew—that is, he was a Jew by race; religiously he was, I believe, an agnostic, though, when his movement had fairly started, he used, I fancy, for political reasons, occasionally to employ old religious terminology. He told the present writer that the violent anti-Semitism of his native country had made him despair of the situation and seek for a fresh solution upon new and nationalist lines. He conceived the theory, grossly libellous alike upon human nature in general and upon the Jews in particular, that anti-Semitism will persist for ever, and that, unless the number of Jews in a given country is the *minutest fraction* of the total population, anti-Semitism will always be rampant and intolerable. The followers of the movement sedulously maintain the monstrous hypothesis of their founder. In England, where anti-Semitism hardly exists, they always notice, harp upon, and even exaggerate, any petty incident or remark of an anti-Semitic or anti-Jewish kind. Even where, according to their own principles, they ought to see nothing but an accurate use of words, they are the loudest to scent anti-Semitism. Thus, if an Australian statesman speaks unfavourably of "German Jews," they are at once up in arms. Now the old Jew, in whose

eyes the Jews constitute a mere religious community, might justly censure the statesman. For to the old Jew the expression "German Jews" is on all fours with the expression "German Catholics," "German Lutherans." As, for him, the "German Jew" is merely a German of the Jewish faith, to emphasise the man's religion, or even to mention the religious denomination to which he happens to belong, seems needless and even offensive. But, to our modern Jewish nationalists, the German Jew is *not* merely a German of the Jewish persuasion. He is a man who, perhaps long resident in Germany, is yet a member of a distinct nation, and that nation is not the German nation, or, at all events, by no means exclusively the German nation. How then is such a composite being to be more precisely and accurately described than by the words a "German Jew"? On nationalist principles the terminology of the Australian statesman was entirely correct. And yet, perhaps, in scenting anti-Semitism everywhere, and in complaining of it, the Jewish nationalists are acting wisely. For of the whole national movement anti-Semitism is the backbone. Assume that there was no anti-Semitism to-morrow, and Zionism, like a pack of cards, would collapse the day after. Still more. Assume that the Jews of Russia and Rumania were in January in the same position, civically and politically, as the Jews of France or Italy, and there would be very little Zionism by December. The fire of the movement is carefully stoked up by its leaders: the fuel is found in anti-Semitism and in civic and political disabilites.

If the movement spreads, it must have the most disastrous results upon the Jews in every country, and more especially in those countries where they are most numerous. For it strikes at the root of the old emancipation arguments and robs equality of its justification. If the Jews are a separate people, with a national culture and with national aspirations of their own, how can they claim full citizenship in any country *outside* their own? Why *should* it be granted them? Why should they even retain it where, under totally false presuppositions, it has been granted them already? How can a man belong to two nations at once? How can he be a Frenchman, or an Italian, and something else as well? No wonder that all anti-Semites are enthusiastic Zionists. They say: "All honour to the Jews, when, at last, they frankly confess that they are not at home among us. All honour to them when they honestly allow that nationally, as well as, or even more than, religiously, they are other than we; that they have separate aims, separate aspirations, and a distinctive civilisation. By all means let them be all segregated together in a country of their own. Good luck to *them* and—good

riddance for *us*. Let the alien element, which cannot assimilate with ourselves, depart for good and all. Unlike their crafty brethren, who claim equality and emancipation, the Zionists *honestly* confess that they are not, and do not want to be, anything but Englishmen, Frenchmen, or Russians of the Jewish persuasion. They boast their own nationhood; they crave their own home. For heaven's sake, let them have it."

It is true that Jewish nationalists attempt answers to the foregoing objections. They *do* demand both emancipation in countries where Jews may still choose to reside, as well as a separate and autonomous Jewish State. Let us examine the nature of the answers and the consistency of the demand.

It is alleged, for example, that a Canadian or an Australian has a double patriotism, and belongs in a sense to two nations. He has a Canadian patriotism and belongs to the Canadian nation, but he has also a larger British and Imperial patriotism, and belongs to the "nation" of the British Empire as a whole. Suppose for a moment that Palestine were to become incorporated within the dominions of England or of France. Why should not the Jews, on Canadian lines, have a specific Jewish nationhood and a specific Jewish patriotism, and at the same time cultivate an Imperial French or British patriotism as well? And, in Canada, some Canadians do not even speak English as their mother tongue. The suggested parallel or analogy is specious, but not convincing.

Even as regards Canada the majority of Canadians *do* speak the English language, and *are* of English descent. All profess one form or another of the Christian faith. If we suppose that two or three million Russian Jews were rapidly imported into Palestine to form there an autonomous State of their own, what likelihood is there that they could, in the Canadian or Australian manner, become also possessed of an Imperial French or British patriotism as well, and feel themselves, with Canadian or Australian passion, members of a French or British Empire, partners in a joint Imperial concern? Those who put forward suggestions of this kind are not really anxious about the larger connection. How should they be? They know nothing of it. They feel nothing of its heart-beats. All *they* are thinking of, and striving for, is the autonomous Jewish State with its *Jewish* national life and its separate, local, and Jewish patriotism.

But while the two or three million Jews are being poured into Palestine, what about the other millions who must for long remain without?

They are, apparently, still to retain their Jewish national feelings and aspirations, and at the same time they are to retain

(where they possess them) civic and political "rights" in the countries of their "exile." Here again certain specious analogies are used. It is said that there are more Norwegians in the United States than in Norway. They become American citizens, but yet maintain a certain Norwegian patriotism. How far (not to mention any other European nation than Norway) is this double patriotism—assuming it to exist—approved of, and agreeable to, the United States? And do these American-Norwegians sedulously cultivate their own language, do they refuse to marry except among themselves, do they desire to remain for all time separate from all other Americans both in race and in religion? *In* the country, but not *of* the country—are these the men and women upon whom a country's rulers would desire to confer full citizenship and equality?

In the beginning of 1914, six or seven million Jews lived in a country where, so far, civic and political equality has been denied them. The Zionists and nationalists demand this equality no less than those Jews who still represent the old "emancipation" point of view. And they maintain that it is precisely in the more Eastern portions of Europe where their own peculiar opinions and desires are most in place. For does not more than one Central or Eastern European Empire contain and include several nationalities, speaking their own language, and with their own subordinate rights and autonomies, within one Imperial whole? Why should there not be one nation and one language the more? I do not know that the multiplicity of nationalities and languages is *so* delightful to the rulers of those Empires that they would view with complacency and favour the alluring prospect of yet one more nationality and one more language to add to the list. However this may be, it is, at all events, clear that the arrangement works least uncomfortably where, within a certain large area, there is a homogeneous mass of persons speaking one language and belonging to one nationality. It also works most comfortably where, *outside* this area, there are but few persons of that particular nationality. How would these conditions apply in the case of the Jews? What is *their* area? And in any given Empire, will they all be collected within that one area?

The truth is that the examples and analogies, when tested, break down. For the Jews there is only one salvation: the uncompromising maintenance of the old emancipation point of view. No separate nationality, no national language; only a religious community, the members of which can be the devoted citizens, or "nationals," of all the countries in which they make

their home, and in which full civic and political rights are assigned to them.

The Jewish religion destroyed the Jewish nation many centuries ago. To revive it were to attempt an impossible anachronism. The Jewish demand for citizenship rests upon the assumption that it is no longer necessary for the citizens of a State to profess one and the same religion. There can be good citizens who are Christians; there can be good citizens who are Jews. There can be members of a given nation who are Christian; there can be members who are Jews. Both can be equally excellent and devoted members of the nation. That is the Jewish contention. We claim that we have made it good.

But what about our new Jewish nationalists and Zionists? And what about their autonomous Jewish State?

We have seen that a "nationalist" Jew may be an atheist or an agnostic. Presumably, therefore, in the autonomous Jewish State the citizens need not be Jews by religion. They may also be agnostics and atheists. But can a nationalist Jew be baptised, and, becoming a Christian, remain a Jew? Apparently not. And, in the autonomous Jewish State, may the citizens be Christians by faith, though Jews by nationality? Or is conversion to Christianity to mean the loss of citizenship? And dare the nationalist Jews demand in Russia what they would hesitate to apply in Judæa? Do they venture to affirm that a good Russian may be by religion a Jew, but that a good Jew cannot be by religion a Christian?

Only by the same arguments, and only in the same spirit, can emancipation be demanded and obtained in Russia as it was demanded and obtained in England or in Italy. The demand must be based upon the conviction that the Jews are a religious community, and a religious community only; that they claim no nationality over and above the nationality of the countries in which they have made their homes, and the devoted citizens of which they desire, and are so well able, to be.

AN ENGLISHMAN OF THE JEWISH FAITH.